

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The office action of April 1, 2009 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-17 have been amended. Claim 19 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 18 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-17 and 19 remain in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Applicants traverse.

Claims 1-18 have been amended to address the rejection. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

Claim 18 stands objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being in improper form. Applicants have canceled claim 18 without prejudice or disclaimer to render the objection moot.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 and 15-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 00/22792 to Pirot (“Pirot”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, inter alia,

wherein classifying the calls further include: sorting a call according to a source site of the call, for each group of calls sorted based on the source site, further sorting the call according to the called number, and allocating a class reference to the sorted calls based on the called number, wherein the class reference is one of: internal or external.

The Action alleges that the features of the classification module are performed by the service management subsystem software of Pirot. See Action, page 4. However, as described in Pirot, the service management subsystem software merely collects and stores call records, applies a tariff rate on the call records and produces a bill. See page 29. In stark contrast, claim 1 calls for

sorting a call according to a source site, sorting a call according to a source site of the call, for each group of calls sorted based on the source site, further sorting the call according to the called number, and allocating a class reference to the sorted calls based on the called number, wherein the class reference is one of: internal or external.

Moreover, claim 1 further recites, *inter alia*,

wherein the billing system is configured to calculate communication costs for a single, corporate telecommunications network including a plurality of sites.

Notably, Pirot is directed to “control this heterogeneous world from network and services control point-of-view”. See page 2. As such, Pirot fails to describe that the system is configured to calculate communication costs for a single, corporate telecommunications network including a plurality of sites as recited in claim 1.

For at least the above-described reasons, Pirot fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-3 and 15-17 depend on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and in further view of the advantageous features recited therein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 5, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pirot in view of WO 01/97546 to Kang (“Kang”), and further in view of Examiner’s Official Notice (“ON”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 6-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pirot in view of Kang, ON and U.S. Patent 6,615,260 to Honda et al. (“Honda”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 4-14 depend on claim 1. However, Kang, ON and Honda, alone or in combination, fail to cure the deficiencies of Pirot with respect to claim 1. As such, even assuming but not conceding that a combination of Pirot, Kang, ON and Honda would have been appropriate, such a combination fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, claims 4-14 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and in further view of the advantageous features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: June 29, 2009

By: /Rick H. Lin/
Rick H. Lin
Registration No. 61,933

1100 13th Street, N.W., Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4051
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001